

From Kampus to Creative Startup: A Hexa-Helix Framework for University Creative-Economy Incubation under Rindekraf 2026–2045

Ika Yuni Purnama, Brigitta Callula, Abigail Husain

October 22, 2026

Abstract

Indonesia's creative-economy master plan for 2026–2045 (Rindekraf, Perpres No. 37/2026) names academia as one of six partners in a hexa-helix model alongside government, business and industry, financial institutions, communities and media. It also sets out campus-relevant instruments, among them intellectual-property centres in universities, university–industry research-collaboration centres, the incubation of research results, and seed funding for creative startups. The plan does not, however, explain how a university should turn teaching, research and community service into creative startups and registered intellectual property. This conceptual working paper addresses that gap. Using a document analysis of Perpres No. 37/2026, UU No. 24/2019 on the Creative Economy and PP No. 24/2022 on IP-based financing, together with a review of Indonesian research on campus incubators, technopreneurship education and creative entrepreneurship, it proposes the Kampus-to-Startup (K2S) framework. K2S is a five-stage campus pipeline: creative talent and ideas, pre-incubation, incubation, IP consolidation, and market and scale. Each stage is mapped to the six helices and to indicators aligned with Rindekraf's first phase (2026–2029). The paper argues that the decisive campus contributions lie less in producing startups than in two often-neglected functions: converting creative work into recorded, transferable IP, and brokering hexa-helix relationships that outlast a student cohort. It discusses risks including IP-ownership disputes, mission drift, founder well-being and the concentration of capacity in Java, and closes with implications for university leaders and with limitations, notably that the framework has not yet been tested empirically.

Keywords: creative economy; university incubation; hexa helix; creative startups; intellectual property; Rindekraf; Indonesia

Introduction

On 2 July 2026 the President of Indonesia signed Peraturan Presiden (Perpres) No. 37/2026 on the Rencana Induk Ekonomi Kreatif (Rindekraf) 2026–2045 [41], the creative-economy master plan required by Undang-Undang (UU) No. 24/2019 on the Creative Economy [39]. The plan restates the national medium-term development target of an 8.0–8.4 per cent creative-economy share of GDP for 2025–2029 and aims for an 11 per cent share by 2045 [41]. It

organises delivery through eight priority programmes, the Asta Ekonomi Kreatif, and through a hexa-helix partnership of government, academia (lembaga pendidikan), business and industry, financial institutions, communities and media [41]. Academia is described as responsible for developing creative talent and for research that supports the creative industries [41].

Ministry–university agreements have begun to make the campus role more concrete. In June 2026 the Ministry of Creative Economy/Creative Economy Agency (Ekraf) signed a memorandum of understanding with BINUS University covering education, research, community service and technology transfer, with the stated aim of opening opportunities for student programmes and creative-economy startups [42].

What remains unclear is how a university is supposed to convert its three core functions, teaching, research and community service (the Tridharma), into creative startups and registered IP. Indonesian universities have extensive experience with business incubators and technopreneurship education [1], [2], [3], but much of this experience comes from digital and technology businesses rather than the creative subsectors that Rindekraf prioritises. This paper asks: *what operating model would allow a university to act as an effective academic helix in Rindekraf's creative-economy ecosystem?*

The paper makes three contributions. First, it extracts from Perpres No. 37/2026 [41] the instruments and phase-one targets that bear directly on universities. Second, it proposes the Kampus-to-Startup (K2S) framework, a five-stage pipeline that links campus activity to those instruments and assigns roles to each helix. Third, it proposes indicators and identifies risks that university leaders should monitor. The paper is conceptual and draws on document analysis and on Indonesian research published in the Pandawan family of journals; it does not report new empirical data.

Background and literature

The policy setting: from UU No. 24/2019 to Rindekraf

UU No. 24/2019 defines the creative economy as the realisation of value added from IP that originates in human creativity based on cultural heritage, science and/or technology (Art. 1). It obliges the government to facilitate IP-based financing schemes (Art. 16) and to facilitate copyright recording and industrial-property registration for creative actors (Art. 23) [39]. Government Regulation (PP) No. 24/2022 implements the financing provision [40]; under it, IP can serve as collateral only if it is supported by an IP certificate or recording letter and by IP-related contracts. For campus-originated work, this sets a practical threshold. A student film, game or fashion collection that has not been recorded and whose ownership has not been documented cannot enter the IP-financing system at all. Copyright certificates as collateral also raise valuation questions that campus IP services will need to address.

Rindekraf diagnoses the sector's weaknesses as an IP ecosystem that is not yet optimal, limited financing, institutions that do not yet function fully, low human-resource competitiveness and poorly integrated supply chains [41]. Among the forms of empowerment it lists are easier access to incubation, easier use of research and innovation results, business mentoring and innovation mentoring [41]. It casts the Ministry of Creative Economy/Creative Economy Agency (Ekraf) as orchestrator and accelerator across the hexa helix. It also names the growth

of creative startups (perusahaan rintisan kreatif) as an important focus [41].

Four of Rindekraf's strategies speak directly to universities:

- **Research.** A research roadmap, research-collaboration centres between universities and industry, regional research networks and an endowment fund for creative-economy research, with the aim of downstreaming research into creative products, business models and IP-based startups [41]. In the phase-one action matrix, research results are to be incubated into commercialisable products, business models and IP, including through startups in priority provinces.
- **Education.** Curricula based on subsector skills and current technology, design thinking at all levels of education, a national talent portal, competency certification, and mentoring and creative-internship programmes [41]. Phase one begins by mapping creative-economy education units, programmes and staff.
- **Financing.** Financial literacy, seed funding for startups and wider access to grants, corporate social responsibility (CSR) funds and crowdfunding [41]. The phase-one action matrix calls for a seed-funding scheme for creative startups to be established and piloted in seven priority subsectors in priority provinces.
- **IP facilitation.** Wider IP registration and recording, an IP Creative Academy, stronger capacity among IP managers and the development of IP centres in universities (sentra kekayaan intelektual di perguruan tinggi) [41]. The phase-one matrix calls for the establishment of such centres, and the plan stresses development outside Java. In later phases these centres are expected to move from registration and recording to commercialisation.

The plan's phase one focuses on seven priority subsectors, listed as film, animation and video; music; fashion; craft; applications and games; and culinary, in 15 priority provinces [41]. The total number of subsectors under the new cluster structure is not restated here, and this paper does not assume one.

Hexa-helix and multi-actor ecosystems

The hexa helix extends earlier triple-helix and penta-helix models of innovation by adding financial institutions and media as distinct partners. Indonesian community-service research has documented penta-helix entrepreneurship ecosystems in which universities, government, business, communities and media jointly support enterprise development [4]. Penta-helix collaboration has also been used to activate local MSME ecosystems around public events in the regions [5]. Qualitative work on digital platforms suggests that they increasingly mediate interactions among entrepreneurs, technologies and supporting stakeholders in innovation ecosystems [6], and similar arguments have been made for digital entrepreneurship [7]. Platform-based ecosystems matter for the hexa helix because they lower the cost of coordination among partners, but they do not by themselves define who is responsible for what.

Campus incubators in Indonesia

A substantial body of Indonesian work examines university incubators. Expert and tenant evaluations of a newly designed technopreneurship incubator model in a college context

report that the model was judged practical and effective [1]. A quantitative study of 50 incubator managers at Raharja University analysed the determinants of incubation success and the factors that moderate them [2]. Qualitative work at the same university's Alphabet Incubator found that incubators help students turn business ideas into firms but that limited technology, management and leadership capacity remain barriers [3]. Design work on the incubator's physical interior illustrates the attention that dedicated space receives in campus incubation [8]. Case analysis of successful Indonesian IT business incubators identifies access to funding, experienced mentors and business networks among the factors that support technology startups [9].

Studies of the student side point in a similar direction. Evidence from 205 university students with incubator and mentoring experience suggests that entrepreneurship courses, mentorship and investment together strengthen students' ability to recognise and create business opportunities [10]. A literature review of technopreneurship argues that higher education shapes students' mindset towards technopreneurship as a career [11]. Survey research on private universities in Banten links lecturers' knowledge management and skills to the growth of student MSMEs [12]. Research on entrepreneurial mindset and self-efficacy among Indonesian business actors shows that both shape entrepreneurial intention [13]. Mixed-methods work with young founders has explored the determinants of startup success in Indonesia [14].

At the institutional level, entrepreneurial good university governance has been associated with service, financial and sustainability performance in Indonesian state universities, with leadership style partly mediating the relationship [15]. Qualitative work argues that an institutional entrepreneurial culture underpins long-term innovation and growth [16]. AI-supported resource allocation has been proposed as a tool for entrepreneurial campus sustainability [17].

From technopreneurship to creative entrepreneurship

The incubation literature reviewed above is dominated by technology and digital-business ventures. Creative ventures have different characteristics. Their core asset is often a work protected by copyright, such as a film, game, song or design, rather than a patentable technology, and their value depends heavily on audience, narrative and cultural meaning. Indonesian research on creative entrepreneurship reflects this. Design thinking has been examined as a business model for creativepreneurs who turn artistic ideas into marketable ventures [18]. Knowledge management has been proposed as a way to convert individual creative ideas into organisational knowledge in the digital creative industry [19]. Studies of creative-industry MSMEs link digital-transformation capabilities to sustainable performance [20]. Phenomenological work on micro-entrepreneurs in emerging Indonesian creative hubs shows how value is co-created informally, often outside formal platforms [21]. Education is consistently identified as a lever: studies report that education prepares a generation of creativepreneurs [22] and that e-learning can foster innovation and creative entrepreneurship in higher education [23].

Subsector-specific studies relevant to Rindekraf's priorities are emerging. Research on Gen Z's motivations and expectations for digital game development addresses the games subsector [24]. Work on online fashion brands links intellectual capital and market-sensing capability to

performance through innovation capability [25]. At the level of the venture pitch, analysis of pitch decks shows how visual language and narrative convey value propositions to investors [26]. These are precisely the communication skills that creative founders need when they approach the financial helix.

Framework and method

Approach

The paper follows a conceptual design. It builds a framework by combining a structured reading of policy documents with a thematic synthesis of the literature. The document analysis covered Perpres No. 37/2026 and its Annex I (narrative chapters and action matrix), obtained from the official JDIH BPK repository [41]; UU No. 24/2019 [39]; PP No. 24/2022 [40]; and published reports of ministry–university agreements [42]. Passages were coded for (a) explicit references to universities, education or research, (b) instruments that a university could host or feed (incubation, IP centres, seed funding, talent portal), and (c) phase-one targets. The literature was then mapped against the coded instruments to identify where evidence exists and where it is thin. The resulting framework is a proposal for discussion. It is not a validated model.

The Kampus-to-Startup (K2S) framework

K2S describes a campus pipeline in five stages. It is not strictly linear: ventures may skip stages, cycle back or exit at any point. The stages are nonetheless useful for assigning responsibilities and indicators.

Stage 1: Creative talent and ideas (Creative Hub Kampus). The pipeline begins in teaching, student activities and community service. Rindekraf's education strategy calls for subsector-based curricula and design thinking. In K2S, the campus creative hub is the place where coursework, studio projects and community-service outputs are gathered and screened for venture potential. Practical skill-building in user-interface and user-experience design for digital products [27] and lean-startup approaches to study-programme design [28] illustrate the kinds of capability this stage develops. Curriculum transformation that integrates digital technopreneurship with industry needs [29] and interdisciplinary learning-factory models that link learning with industrial practice [30] offer further templates.

Stage 2: Pre-incubation (validation). Promising ideas are tested with users and markets before significant resources are committed. Design-thinking cycles of empathy, ideation, prototyping and testing [18] fit naturally here. Pre-incubation should also include an early IP check: who created the work, whether third-party material, including cultural material from communities, is involved, and what agreements are needed.

Stage 3: Incubation (venture building). Selected teams receive mentoring, workspace, networks and initial funding. The evidence on Indonesian campus incubators [1], [2], [9] and on the joint effect of courses, mentoring and investment [10] is most directly relevant here. Rindekraf's planned seed-funding scheme and its emphasis on mentoring (pendampingan) provide policy anchors. For creative ventures, incubation should include mentors from the relevant subsector, such as producers, publishers, game studios or fashion houses, rather than generic business coaches only. Data-driven tools have been proposed for analysing and

supporting startup collaboration [31] and for predicting startup-ecosystem trends [32], but their value in small creative cohorts is unproven.

Stage 4: IP consolidation (Sentra KI Kampus). This stage is specific to the creative economy and is often missing from campus incubation. Creative outputs are recorded or registered, ownership and licensing are documented, and the venture's IP portfolio is made legible to financiers. Rindekraf's planned university IP centres and the requirements of PP No. 24/2022 make this stage a precondition for IP-based financing [40], [41]. Blockchain-based IP management has been examined as a way to improve security and transparency for digital entrepreneurs [33]. Such tools may help with provenance records, but legal recording with the IP office remains the threshold that matters for financing under PP No. 24/2022.

Stage 5: Market and scale. Ventures connect with buyers, platforms, investors and export channels. Ekraf's market-access, platform and export-facilitation programmes are natural destinations. Financing options extend beyond banks to crowdfunding: research on millennials' intention to invest through securities crowdfunding identifies trust, perceived usefulness and social influence as drivers [34], and fintech has been discussed as a financing route for small enterprises [35]. Pitch communication [26] and platform strategies [6] become critical at this stage.

Hexa-helix roles across the pipeline

K2S assigns each helix a primary role:

- **Academia (the university):** runs the creative hub, pre-incubation and incubation; hosts or partners with an IP centre; contributes research and talent data to the national talent portal; and aligns curricula with priority subsectors.
- **Government (Ekraf, the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology, the Ministry of Law/DJKI, and regional governments):** provides seed funding, IP facilitation and access to Ekraf programmes, and sets data standards.
- **Business and industry:** provides subsector mentors, internships, co-production and first contracts, and offers licensing partnerships for student IP.
- **Financial institutions:** provide financial-literacy training, assess IP-backed financing readiness and offer seed, grant, CSR and crowdfunding channels.
- **Communities:** provide user testing, cultural knowledge and local markets. Where community cultural expressions are used, they must also be partners in consent and benefit-sharing.
- **Media:** provide showcasing, audience building and dissemination, including campus media as an early channel.

The design principle is that the university should not try to play all six roles. Its comparative advantage lies in talent, research, convening power and continuity across cohorts. Evidence that partnerships with industry and supportive policies shape institutional outcomes [36] supports this division of labour.

Indicators aligned with Rindekraf phase one

The following indicators are proposed for 2026–2029. They are illustrative and need validation and baseline data.

- *Talent and ideas*: number of students completing subsector-based creative courses; number of creative projects screened by the hub each year; share of hub projects from outside the arts and design faculties.
- *Pre-incubation and incubation*: number of creative ventures incubated per year by subsector, with priority subsectors identified; share with at least one subsector-industry mentor; seed or grant funding obtained.
- *IP consolidation*: number of creative works recorded or registered; share of incubated ventures with documented ownership and licensing; number of IP-backed financing applications prepared.
- *Market and scale*: ventures surviving two years after graduation from the incubator; revenue, jobs and exports reported by alumni ventures; number of ventures listed on Ekraf platforms or participating in Ekraf programmes.
- *Hexa-helix continuity*: number of active partner agreements in each helix; partnerships sustained for more than two years; share of mentors returning across cohorts.

Where possible, indicators should be reported in formats compatible with Rindekraf's creative-economy data programme and with the planned national talent portal, so that campus outcomes can be counted towards national targets.

Discussion

The underestimated stage: IP consolidation

The framework suggests that the most distinctive contribution a university can make to Rindekraf is not the number of startups it launches but the volume and quality of creative IP it helps to consolidate. Many campus incubators measure tenants, events and pitch competitions. For creative ventures, however, the binding constraint is often that the core asset has not been recorded, ownership among team members and the university is unclear, and no licensing template exists. Until these issues are resolved, PP No. 24/2022 places IP-based financing out of reach. Rindekraf's call for IP centres in universities, with an emphasis on regions outside Java [41], gives universities a policy route to address this, but it also implies that IP services should be organised around creative subsectors and not only around patents.

Technopreneurship evidence and creative ventures

The Indonesian evidence base on campus incubation is substantial, but it is mostly drawn from technology and digital-business ventures and from a small number of institutions, including Raharja University [2], [3]. Generalising from it to film, music, fashion or craft ventures requires caution. Creative ventures often have longer gestation periods, project-based revenue and a closer dependence on cultural communities. Incubation models may need longer timeframes, project-finance logic and sector-specific mentors. The creative-entrepreneurship literature [18], [20], [21] helps bridge this gap, but direct evaluations of creative-economy incubators in Indonesian universities are scarce.

Risks

Five risks deserve attention.

- 1 **IP-ownership conflict.** Unclear policies on who owns student, staff and jointly created works can deter students or lead to disputes. Universities need transparent IP policies that default to student ownership of student-initiated work, with clear terms where university resources are substantial.
- 2 **Mission drift and vanity metrics.** Incubators can drift towards counting events and tenants. Indicators should prioritise survival, IP and revenue outcomes.
- 3 **Cultural extraction.** Ventures that commercialise community heritage, such as motifs, music or stories, without consent or benefit-sharing undermine both ethics and long-term legitimacy.
- 4 **Founder well-being.** Startup founding is demanding. Research on Indonesian startup founders has examined how personal resources relate to subjective well-being and innovative behaviour [37]. Incubation programmes should treat well-being as a design concern.
- 5 **Regional concentration.** Capacity is concentrated in Java, while Rindekraf emphasises priority provinces and development outside Java [41]. Partnerships between Java-based universities and regional campuses, and digital incubation platforms, may help, provided they build local capacity rather than extracting talent.

Continuity across cohorts

A recurring weakness of campus programmes is that they reset each academic year. The hexa-helix design addresses this only if partnerships are institutionalised. Alumni can play a role here: research on MBA alumni with technopreneurship and edupreneurship experience links the value of that experience and alumni satisfaction to continuing commitment to the institution [38]. Alumni founders can return as mentors, investors and partners, closing the loop of the pipeline.

Implications for higher education

- 1 **Map before you build.** Rindekraf's education strategy begins by mapping creative-economy education units, programmes and staff. Universities can anticipate this by mapping their own creative courses, projects, staff expertise and existing IP outputs by subsector.
- 2 **Create or join an IP centre with a creative-subsector mandate.** Universities should either establish an IP centre or partner with one, especially in priority provinces outside Java. Its mandate should explicitly cover copyright recording, licensing templates and IP-financing readiness for creative works.
- 3 **Adopt a clear IP policy for student creative work.** A short, public policy on ownership, revenue sharing and the use of community cultural material reduces uncertainty for student founders.
- 4 **Recruit subsector mentors and partners.** Each priority subsector should have at least one industry partner and mentor pool, linked to internships and co-production opportunities.

- 5 **Integrate incubation with curriculum and credit.** Venture work can be recognised through academic-credit mechanisms, so that incubation is not merely extracurricular.
- 6 **Report in national formats.** Universities should align their indicators with national creative-economy data and the national talent portal so that their outcomes become visible in national monitoring.

Limitations

This paper has several limitations. First, it is conceptual. The K2S framework, the hexa-helix role assignments and the indicators have not been tested in any university. Second, the policy analysis rests on Perpres No. 37/2026 as published [41], on UU No. 24/2019 and PP No. 24/2022 [39], [40] and on published reports of ministry–university agreements [42]. The implementation status of such agreements is not yet documented, and the plan's implementing details, such as the seed-funding scheme, are still being designed. Third, the Indonesian evidence on incubation comes largely from technology and digital-business ventures and from a small number of institutions, so its transfer to creative subsectors is uncertain. Fourth, under the series' current citation policy the reference list is drawn from a single family of Indonesian-hosted journals. The paper therefore does not engage directly with the wider international literature on university incubation, academic entrepreneurship and creative industries, and this should be strengthened in revision. Finally, the total number of subsectors under the new cluster structure is not analysed here.

Conclusion

Rindekraf gives Indonesian universities an explicit place in the creative-economy ecosystem as one of six helices, together with concrete instruments, including research incubation, campus IP centres, seed funding and a national talent portal, that a campus can host or feed. What it does not provide is an operating model. The Kampus-to-Startup framework proposes one: a five-stage pipeline from creative talent and ideas to market and scale, with explicit roles for each helix and indicators aligned with Rindekraf's first phase. Its central claim is that universities add most value by consolidating creative IP and by institutionalising hexa-helix relationships that persist across cohorts, rather than by maximising the number of startups. Piloting the framework in a small number of universities, including at least one in a priority province outside Java, during 2026–2029 would allow it to be tested and refined while the master plan's first phase is still under way.

References

- [1] L. Larisang, S. Sanusi, M. A. Bora, and A. Hamid, "Practicality and Effectiveness of New Technopreneurship Incubator Model in The Digitalization Era," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 318–333, Jul. 2025, doi: 10.34306/att.v7i2.482.
- [2] N. P. L. Santoso, R. A. Sunarjo, and I. S. Fadli, "Analyzing the Factors Influencing the Success of Business Incubation Programs: A SmartPLS Approach," *ADI J. Recent Innov.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 60–71, Sep. 2023, doi: 10.34306/ajri.v5i1.985.
- [3] A. S. Bist, "The Importance of Building a Digital Business Startup in College," *Startupreneur Bus. Digit.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 31–42, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.33050/sabda.v2i1.265.
- [4] M. H. R. Chakim, U. Rahardja, E. D. Astuti, E. Erika, and C. T. Hua, "The Social Empowerment Role of the Penta Helix Entrepreneurship Ecosystem in Driving the National Economy," *ADI Pengabd.*

- Masy. J., vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–13, Sep. 2025, doi: 10.34306/adimas.v6i1.1283.
- [5] G. S. Waskita, D. R. Widi Ashari, S. Izzah, D. Rahmawati, and A. Permadi, "Pentahelix Collaboration for MSME Entrepreneurship Ecosystem Development during National Santri Day," *ADI Pengabd. Masy. J.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 224–237, Jun. 2026, doi: 10.34306/adimas.v6i2.1463.
 - [6] Y. Wulansari, N. S. Arasid, and O. Qurotulain, "The Role of Digital Platforms in Shaping Entrepreneurial Innovation Ecosystems," *ADI Bisnis Digit. Interdisiplin J.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 48–57, Jun. 2026, doi: 10.34306/19amev85.
 - [7] A. Abudaqa and I. Noburu, "Optimizing Digipreneurship in the Growth of the Digital Millennial Creative Economy Ecosystem," *Startupreneur Bus. Digit.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 24–34, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.33050/sabda.v4i1.681.
 - [8] I. K. Mertayasa, U. Rahardja, M. Hardini, and E. P. Harahap, "Interior Design Alphabet Incubator 3.0 Based on Planner 5D," *Technomedia J.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 82–108, May 2023, doi: 10.33050/tmj.v8i1.1982.
 - [9] A. Padli, N. Khairunnisa, A. Khanza, D. Andayani, and E. Halim, "Strategi Pengembangan Startup Teknologi di Indonesia Melalui IT Business Incubation," *J. MENTARI*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 73–80, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.33050/mentari.v3i1.621.
 - [10] I. D. Utama, P. Prabowo, and Z. Mohd, "Integrating Business Courses Mentorship Programs and Investment to Enhance Entrepreneurial Opportunities," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 228–239, Mar. 2025, doi: 10.34306/att.v7i1.525.
 - [11] N. N. Rafiana, "Technopreneurship Strategy to Grow Entrepreneurship Career Options for Students in Higher Education," *ADI J. Recent Innov.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 110–126, Mar. 2024, doi: 10.34306/ajri.v5i2.995.
 - [12] H. Hamsinah, U. Rusilowati, and D. Sunarsi, "Analysis of Lecturer Competency and Knowledge in Technopreneurship Development of Student MSMEs in PTS," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 623–638, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.34306/att.v6i3.365.
 - [13] D. Indiyati, A. Prasetyo, F. P. Sary, N. Dudija, and U. Rahardja, "The Impact of Mindset and Self-Efficacy on Entrepreneurial Intentions in Indonesia," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 850–861, Aug. 2026, doi: 10.34306/att.v8i3.752.
 - [14] N. Lachlan and O. Smith, "Determining Factors for Startup Success in Indonesia: Perspective of Young Entrepreneurs," *Startupreneur Bus. Digit.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 115–122, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.33050/sabda.v3i2.632.
 - [15] R. D. Hadiwidjaja, A. I. Suroso, H. Siregar, and I. Sailah, "Performance Paradigm: Entrepreneurial Good University Governance Mediating Leadership Style in State Universities," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 492–508, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.34306/att.v6i3.453.
 - [16] O. Agnu Dian Wulandari, D. Apriani, and Y. Febriansyah, "Sustainable Institutional Entrepreneurial Culture and Innovation For Economic Growth," *Aptisi Trans. Manage.*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 214–223, Sep. 2023, doi: 10.33050/atm.v7i3.2127.
 - [17] J. Juanda, R. J. Riansyah, A. Arsadi, and L. Bethany, "Towards Entrepreneurial Campus Sustainability: Integrating Artificial Intelligence for Resource Allocation in Business Management," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 314–323, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.34306/att.v6i3.410.
 - [18] D. Abbas, K. Siahaan, and M. Yusup, "Design Thinking as a Business Model for Empowering Creative Entrepreneurs in the Digital Era," *Startupreneur Bus. Digit.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 124–133, Oct. 2025, doi: 10.33050/sabda.v4i2.805.
 - [19] L. H. A. P. Prawira, A. F. Ummah, M. R. Aditiya, and D. W. Nugroho, "Knowledge Management: Efforts to Create an Excellent Digital Creative Industry," *Startupreneur Bus. Digit.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 172–181, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.33050/sabda.v2i2.365.
 - [20] A. Widyakto, S. Wahyudi, and I. R. D. Pangestuti, "Sustainable Growth for Creative Industry MSMEs through Digital Transformation Entrepreneurship," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 889–901, Aug. 2026, doi: 10.34306/att.v8i3.654.

- [21] G. S. Waskita, D. R. W. Ashari, M. B. Al Haris, A. Rifa'i, and S. Izzah, "Value Co-Creation in The Gig Economy: Phenomenological Study of Micro Entrepreneurs in Emerging Indonesian Creative Hubs," *ADI Bisnis Digit. Interdisiplin J.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 58–69, Jun. 2026, doi: 10.34306/54g0he22.
- [22] F. Zidan, D. Nugroho, R. Asri, and S. Agustina, "Peran Pendidikan dalam Mempersiapkan Generasi Creativepreneur di Masa Depan," *ADI Bisnis Digit. Interdisiplin J.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 41–46, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.34306/abdi.v5i1.1099.
- [23] M. G. Hardini, T. Khaizure, and G. Godwin, "Exploring the Effectiveness of E-Learning in Fostering Innovation and Creative Entrepreneurship in Higher Education," *Startuppreneur Bus. Digit.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 34–42, Apr. 2024, doi: 10.33050/sabda.v3i1.441.
- [24] T. Wibowo, M. H. Kho, D. S. Tan, and L. Cen, "Gen Z's Motivations and Expectations for Digital Game Development in Indonesia," *Technomedia J.*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 41–54, Oct. 2025, doi: 10.33050/tmj.v10i2.2510.
- [25] S. L. Sitorus, A. Hermawan, A. W. Widjaja, and M. P. Berlianto, "Enhancing Digital Fashionpreneurship Through Innovation Capability and Market Sensing," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 645–658, Jul. 2026, doi: 10.34306/att.v8i2.721.
- [26] U. Rahardja, M. Budiarto, K. Lutfiyah, O. F. P. Wahyudi, I. K. H. Azz, N. Azizah, and D. Julianingsih, "Analysis of the Effectiveness of Visual Language and Narrative in Conveying Value Propositions in Pitching Decks," *Int. Trans. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 161–170, May 2025, doi: 10.33050/italic.v3i2.807.
- [27] L. Meria, M. S. Gunawan, S. Solahudin, U. Rahardja, and A. Patel, "Enhancing Digital Business Students Competence through UI/UX Design Training for Digital Product Development," *ADI Pengabd. Masy. J.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 133–144, May 2026, doi: 10.34306/adimas.v6i2.1467.
- [28] Z. Queen, A. Anjani, and A. G. Prawiyog, "Designing a Digital Business Study Program using Lean Startup Methodology," *Startuppreneur Bus. Digit.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–9, Apr. 2024, doi: 10.33050/sabda.v3i1.434.
- [29] B. Tjahjono, D. Hermawan, S. Millah, and R. Evans, "Bridging the Skills Gap Curriculum Transformation for Automation Industries and the Role of Digital Technopreneurship," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 650–662, Jul. 2025, doi: 10.34306/att.v7i2.620.
- [30] K. Moyo, S. D. W. Prajanti, M. Muhtarom, and F. Adzim, "Evaluating the Impact of Interdisciplinary Learning Factory Models on Innovation Skills Using Statistical Analysis," *Int. Trans. Educ. Technol.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 100–115, May 2026, doi: 10.33050/itee.v4i2.1081.
- [31] S. Wijono, U. Rahardja, H. D. Purnomo, N. Lutfiani, and N. A. Yusuf, "Leveraging Machine Learning Models to Enhance Startup Collaboration and Drive Technopreneurship," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 6, no. 3, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.34306/att.v6i3.462.
- [32] A. Kanivia, H. Febiansyah, U. Rahardja, K. Adiyarta, and J. Anderson, "Advanced Predictive Models for the Startup Ecosystem Using Machine Learning Algorithms," *Aptisi Trans. Manage.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 221–230, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.33050/atm.v8i3.2345.
- [33] M. Murod, S. Anhar, D. Andayani, A. Fitriani, and G. Khanna, "Blockchain Based Intellectual Property Management Enhancing Security and Transparency in Digital Entrepreneurship," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 7, no. 1, Mar. 2025, doi: 10.34306/att.v7i1.521.
- [34] N. M. Nila Febrianti and G. S. Darma, "Millennials' Intention to Invest through Securities Crowdfunding Platform," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 19–30, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.34306/att.v5i1.280.
- [35] S. Maulana, I. M. Nasution, Y. Shino, and A. R. S. Panjaitan, "Fintech As A Financing Solution For Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises," *Startuppreneur Bus. Digit.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 71–82, Apr. 2022, doi: 10.33050/sabda.v1i1.76.
- [36] U. Rusilowati, F. P. Oganda, R. Rahardja, T. Nurtino, and E. Aimee, "Innovation in Smart Marketing: The Role of Technopreneurs in Driving Educational Improvement," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 305–318, Nov. 2023, doi: 10.34306/att.v5i3.359.

- [37] T. S. Agustina, A. T. GENÇ, and A. Prasetyo, "Spiritual Capital Innovative Work Behavior and Subjective Well Being of Startup Founders," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 365–376, Mar. 2026, doi: 10.34306/att.v8i1.614.
- [38] L. A. M. Nelloh, H. Hartoyo, U. Sumarwan, A. Wirakartakusumah, and S. H. Joo, "Commitment Beyond Graduation Through Entrepreneurial Leadership Experience in MBA Program," *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneurship*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 99–113, Mar. 2026, doi: 10.34306/att.v8i1.713.
- [39] Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 24 Tahun 2019 tentang Ekonomi Kreatif [Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 24 of 2019 on the Creative Economy], *Lembaran Negara RI Tahun 2019 No. 212*, Oct. 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/123686/uu-no-24-tahun-2019>
- [40] Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 24 Tahun 2022 tentang Peraturan Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang Nomor 24 Tahun 2019 tentang Ekonomi Kreatif [Government Regulation No. 24 of 2022 on the Implementation of Law No. 24 of 2019 on the Creative Economy], *Lembaran Negara RI Tahun 2022 No. 151*, Jul. 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/216815/pp-no-24-tahun-2022>
- [41] Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 37 Tahun 2026 tentang Rencana Induk Ekonomi Kreatif Tahun 2026–2045 [Presidential Regulation No. 37 of 2026 on the Creative Economy Master Plan 2026–2045], *Lembaran Negara RI Tahun 2026 No. 70*, Jul. 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/351523/perpres-no-37-tahun-2026>
- [42] ANTARA, "Kemenekraf gandeng BINUS perkuat ekosistem ekonomi kreatif nasional," *ANTARA News*, Jun. 26, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.antaranews.com/berita/5623639/kemenekraf-gandeng-binus-perkuat-ekosistem-ekonomi-kreatif-nasional>